

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/655,823	Applicant(s) AWAKURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Dean O. Takaoka	Art Unit 2817	

All Participants:

(1) Dean O. Takaoka.

(2) Bradley N. Ruben.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
35 U.S.C. 102(b)
Claims discussed:
all
Prior art documents discussed:
Ehman et al., Saitou et al.
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that with respect to Applicant's amendment dated January 14, 2005, claim 19 remained anticipated by Ehman et al. Ehman et al. shows a conductor pattern comprising signal lines 22 and connections to components 26/54. With respect to arguments regarding thin film, while Ehman et al. does not explicitly recite thin film (e.g. magnetic ink), it was the position of the Examiner that another reference, Saitou et al., teaches a screened paste being a thin film, analogous to an applied magnetic ink, obviating Applicant's arguments with respect to the thin film. It was agreed Ehman et al. did not teach or suggest ground in the circuit and it was agreed to positively include the ground part limitation in claim 19 placing the claim/s in condition for allowance. It was agreed add claim 40 and to make the changes by Examiner's amendment..